Andrea Darrow Smith, Esq. (SBN: 265237) 1 andrea@westcoastlitigation.co, 2 Robert L. Hyde, Esq. (SBN: 227183) bob@westcoastlitigation.com 3 Joshua B. Swigart, Esq. (SBN: 225557) josh@westcoastlitigation.com 4 **Hyde & Swigart** 5 4129 Main Street, Suite B8 Riverside, CA 92501 6 (951) 784-7770 7 (619) 297-1022 8

Attorneys for Kara Espinosa

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

HYDE & SWIGART Riverside, California

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

Kara Espinosa	Case No: 11CV2971 MMAPOR
Plaintiff, v. Newport Capital Recovery Group II,	Complaint For Damages Jury Trial Demanded
LLC; Kenosian & Miele, LLP Defendant.	

Introduction

1. The United States Congress has found abundant evidence of the use of abusive, deceptive, and unfair debt collection practices by many debt collectors, and has determined that abusive debt collection practices contribute to the number of personal bankruptcies, to marital instability, to the loss of jobs, and to invasions of individual privacy. Congress wrote the Fair Debt Collection Practices Act, 15 U.S.C. § 1692 et seq. (hereinafter "FDCPA"), to eliminate abusive debt collection practices by debt collectors, to insure that those debt collectors who refrain from using abusive debt

Complaint - 1 of 10 -

- - 1 ~

- collection practices are not competitively disadvantaged, and to promote consistent State action to protect consumers against debt collection abuses.
- 2. The California legislature has determined that the banking and credit system and grantors of credit to consumers are dependent upon the collection of just and owing debts and that unfair or deceptive collection practices undermine the public confidence that is essential to the continued functioning of the banking and credit system and sound extensions of credit to consumers. The Legislature has further determined that there is a need to ensure that debt collectors exercise this responsibility with fairness, honesty and due regard for the debtor's rights and that debt collectors must be prohibited from engaging in unfair or deceptive acts or practices.
- 3. Kara Espinosa, ("Plaintiff"), through Plaintiff's attorneys, brings this action to challenge the actions of Newport Capital Recovery Group II, LLC, ("Defendant Newport Capital") and Kenosian & Miele, LLP ("Defendant K&M") (collectively "Defendants"), with regard to attempts by Defendants to unlawfully and abusively collect a debt allegedly owed by Plaintiff, and this conduct caused Plaintiff damages.
- 4. Plaintiff makes these allegations on information and belief, with the exception of those allegations that pertain to a plaintiff, or to a plaintiff's counsel, which Plaintiff alleges on personal knowledge.
- 5. While many violations are described below with specificity, this Complaint alleges violations of the statutes cited in their entirety.
- 6. Unless otherwise stated, all the conduct engaged in by Defendants took place in California.
- 7. Any violations by Defendants were knowing, willful, and intentional, and Defendant did not maintain procedures reasonably adapted to avoid any such violation.

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

- 8. Any and all violations alleged against Defendant K&M are imputed to Defendant Newport Capital under the theory of vicarious liability, because the actions undertaken by Defendant K&M were an attempt to collect the alleged debt by an attorney's office on behalf of Defendant Newport Capital.
- 9. All violations alleged under the FDCPA and Rosenthal Act are alleged as against all Defendants.

JURISDICTION AND VENUE

- 10. Jurisdiction of this Court arises pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1331, 15 U.S.C. § 1692(k), and 28 U.S.C. § 1367 for supplemental state claims.
- 11. This action arises out of Defendant's violations of the Fair Debt Collection Practices Act, 15 U.S.C. §§ 1692 et seq. ("FDCPA") and the Rosenthal Fair Debt Collection Practices Act, California Civil Code §§ 1788-1788.32 ("Rosenthal Act").
- 12. Because Defendants do business within the State of California, personal jurisdiction is established.
- 13. Venue is proper pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1391.
- 14. At all times relevant, Defendants conducted business within the State of California.

19 PARTIES

- 20 15. Plaintiff is a natural person who resides in the City of San Diego, in the State of California.
- Defendant Newport is located in the City of Newport Beach, in the State ofCalifornia.
- 24 17. Defendant K&M is located in the City of Los Angeles, in the State of California.
- 26 18. Plaintiff is obligated or allegedly obligated to pay a debt, and is a "consumer" as that term is defined by 15 U.S.C. § 1692a(3).

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

- 19. Defendants are persons who use an instrumentality of interstate commerce or the mails in a business the principal purpose of which is the collection of debts, or who regularly collects or attempts to collect, directly or indirectly, debts owed or due or asserted to be owed or due another and are therefore debt collectors as that phrase is defined by 15 U.S.C. § 1692a(6).
- Plaintiff is a natural person from whom a debt collector sought to collect a 20. consumer debt which was due and owing or alleged to be due and owing from Plaintiff, and is a "debtor" as that term is defined by California Civil Code § 1788.2(h).
- 21. Defendants, in the ordinary course of business, regularly, on behalf of themselves, or others, engages in debt collection as that term is defined by California Civil Code § 1788.2(b), are therefore debt collectors as that term is defined by California Civil Code § 1788.2(c).
- 22. This case involves money, property or their equivalent, due or owing or alleged to be due or owing from a natural person by reason of a consumer credit transaction. As such, this action arises out of a consumer debt and "consumer credit" as those terms are defined by Cal. Civ. Code § 1788.2(f).

FACTUAL ALLEGATIONS

- Sometime before 2009, Plaintiff is alleged to have incurred certain financial 23. obligations.
- 24. These financial obligations were primarily for personal, family or household purposes and are therefore a "debt" as that term is defined by 15 U.S.C. §1692a(5).
- 25. These alleged obligations were money, property, or their equivalent, which is due or owing, or alleged to be due or owing, from a natural person to another person and are therefore a "debt" as that term is defined by California Civil Code §1788.2(d), and a "consumer debt" as that term is defined by California Civil Code §1788.2(f).

2

3

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

- 26. Sometime thereafter, but before 2009, Plaintiff allegedly fell behind in the payments allegedly owed on the alleged debt. Plaintiff currently takes no position as to the validity of this alleged debt.
- 4 27. Subsequently, but before 2009, the alleged debt was assigned, placed, or otherwise transferred, to Defendant for collection.
 - 28. In 2009 Plaintiff received a telephone call from Defendant Newport Capital attempting to collect the alleged debt from her.
 - 29. This communication to Plaintiff was a "communication" as that term is defined by 15 U.S.C. § 1692a(2), and an "initial communication" consistent with 15 U.S.C. § 1692g(a).
 - 30. This communication was a "debt collection" as Cal. Civ. Code 1788.2(b) defines that phrase, and an "initial communication" consistent with Cal. Civ. Code § 1812.700(b).
 - 31. During her 2009 telephonic conversation with Defendant Newport Capital Plaintiff requested verification of the alleged debt to be mailed to her and she provided Defendant Newport Capital with her current residential address.
- 17 32. Per their 2009 telephone conversation, Defendant Newport Capital sent Plaintiff a form letter stating it owned the alleged debt.
- 19 33. Defendant Newport Capital sent its letter to Plaintiff at the residential address
 20 which she had provided during the 2009 telephone conversation.
- 21 34. There were no communications between Plaintiff and Defendant Newport 22 Capital from 2009 until September 2011 when Plaintiff's bank account was 23 levied.
- 24 35. Upon discovery of a bank levy on her personal banking account Plaintiff immediately contacted the San Diego Sheriff's Department.
- 36. The San Diego Sheriff's Department informed Plaintiff that the bank levy was
 executed on behalf of Defendant Newport Capital because Defendant
 Newport Capital had filed a state court collections case against her and

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

- obtained a default judgment against her in San Diego Superior Court, case number 37-2010-00095730-CL-CTL.
- 37. Shortly after her communication with the San Diego Sheriff's Department Plaintiff obtained copies of the documents filed in the state court collections case, to include the proof of service of summons filed by Defendants.
- 38. Defendant Newport Capital, through its attorney Defendant K&M, had filed a proof of service in the state court collections case which stated that Plaintiff had been served the summons and complaint via substitute service at an address which Plaintiff had never resided at- her ex-husband's parents' house.
- 39. In September 2011, Plaintiff telephoned Defendant Newport Capital and informed Defendant Newport Capital that she had never received any paperwork, to include the summons and complaint, regarding the state court collections case.
- 40. During the September 2011 telephone call Plaintiff asked Defendant Newport Capital why no paperwork regarding the state court collections case had been sent to her residential address which she had provided to Defendant Newport in 2009.
- 41. Defendant Newport informed Plaintiff, that her residential address had been "vacant" at the time Defendant Newport had served the state court lawsuit.
- 42. Plaintiff's address was in fact not vacant at the time of alleged service of the state court summons, as Plaintiff was both a resident and the property manager of the building.
- 43. Furthermore, due to her position as property manager, Plaintiff's name and telephone number were visibly posted on the building.
- 25 44. Plaintiff received no telephone call from anyone attempting to serve the summons and complaint for the state court collections case.

27 ///

28 ///

- 45. During her September 2011 conversation with Defendant Newport Capital Plaintiff even confirmed that her correct residential address was in Defendant Newport Capital's file.
- 46. Immediately following her September 2011 telephone conversation with Defendant Newport Capital, Plaintiff filed a claim of exemption in the state court collections case to prevent further bank levy action.
- 47. Defendants opposed Plaintiff's claim of exemption filing in the state court collections case.
- 48. Plaintiff then retained current counsel to file a motion to set aside the default judgment in the state court collections case.
- 49. Plaintiff's counsel prepared and filed a motion to set aside default judgment and quash service of summons in the state court action on November 2, 2011.
- 50. Defendants did not oppose Plaintiff's motion, but rather filed a limited opposition to Plaintiff's request for sanctions.
- 51. On November 17, 2011 Plaintiff's motion was heard before the San Diego Superior Court and the state court granted Plaintiff's motion, vacating Defendant Newport Capital's judgment, quashing service of summons, and imposing sanctions on Defendants for their recklessness by failing to serve Plaintiff at her correct address which Defendants had on file.
- 52. Through this conduct, Defendants collected or attempted to collect a consumer debt by means of judicial proceedings when the debt collector knew that service of process had not been legally effected. Consequently, Defendants violated Cal. Civ. Code § 1788.15(a).
- 53. Through this conduct, Defendants used a false, deceptive, or misleading representation or means in connection with the collection of a debt. Consequently, Defendants violated 15 U.S.C. § 1692e and 15 U.S.C. § 1692e (10).

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

- 54. Because this violated certain portions of the federal Fair Debt Collection Practices Act as these portions are incorporated by reference in the Rosenthal Fair Debt Collection Practices Act, through California Civil Code § 1788.17, this conduct or omission violated Cal. Civ. Code § 1788.17.
- 55. Through this conduct, Defendants were collecting an amount (including any interest, fee, charge, or expense incidental to the principal obligation) when such amount was not expressly authorized by the agreement creating the debt or permitted by law. Consequently, Defendants violated 15 U.S.C. § 1692f (1).
- 56. Because this violated certain portions of the federal Fair Debt Collection Practices Act as these portions are incorporated by reference in the Rosenthal Fair Debt Collection Practices Act, through California Civil Code § 1788.17, this conduct or omission violated Cal. Civ. Code § 1788.17.
- 57. Due to Defendants actions, Plaintiff suffered actual damages in the form of attorneys fees and costs incurred in her efforts to set aside the state court default judgment.
- 58. Due to Defendants' actions, Plaintiff suffered further actual damages in the form of mental anguish which manifested in symptoms including but not limited to: nervousness, stress, anxiety, loss of sleep, and fear of answering the telephone, feelings of hopelessness, guilt, helplessness, irritability, and restlessness, all impacting Plaintiff's personal relationships.

22 ///

23 ///

24 ///

25 | ///

26 ///

27 | ///

28 ///

Complaint - 8 of 10 -

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

CAUSES OF ACTION

COUNT I

FAIR DEBT COLLECTION PRACTICES ACT (FDCPA)

15 U.S.C. §§ 1692 ET SEQ.

- 59. Plaintiff repeats, re-alleges, and incorporates by reference, all other paragraphs.
- 60. The foregoing acts and omissions constitute numerous and multiple violations of the FDCPA, including but not limited to each and every one of the above-cited provisions of the FDCPA, 15 U.S.C. § 1692 et seq.
- 61. As a result of each and every violation of the FDCPA, Plaintiff is entitled to any actual damages pursuant to 15 U.S.C. § 1692k(a)(1); statutory damages in an amount up to \$1,000.00 pursuant to 15 U.S.C. § 1692k(a)(2)(A); and, reasonable attorney's fees and costs pursuant to 15 U.S.C. § 1692k(a)(3) from Defendants.

COUNT II

ROSENTHAL FAIR DEBT COLLECTION PRACTICES ACT (ROSENTHAL ACT) CAL. CIV. CODE §§ 1788-1788.32

- 62. Plaintiff repeats, re-alleges, and incorporates by reference, all other paragraphs.
- 63. The foregoing acts and omissions constitute numerous and multiple violations of the Rosenthal Act, including but not limited to each and every one of the above-cited provisions of the Rosenthal Act, Cal. Civ. Code §§ 1788-1788.32
- 64. As a result of each and every violation of the Rosenthal Act, Plaintiff is entitled to any actual damages pursuant to Cal. Civ. Code § 1788.30(a); statutory damages for a knowing or willful violation in the amount up to \$1,000.00 pursuant to Cal. Civ. Code § 1788.30(b); and reasonable attorney's fees and costs pursuant to Cal. Civ. Code § 1788.30(c) from Defendants.

28 ///

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

PRAYER FOR RELIEF

WHEREFORE, Plaintiff prays that judgment be entered against each Defendant, jointly and severally, and Plaintiff be awarded damages from each Defendant, as follows:

- An award of actual damages pursuant to 15 U.S.C. § 1692k(a)(1);
- An award of statutory damages of \$1,000.00 pursuant to 15 U.S.C. \$ 1692k(a)(2)(A);
- An award of costs of litigation and reasonable attorney's fees, pursuant to 15 U.S.C. § 1692k(a)(3);
- An award of actual damages pursuant to California Civil Code § 1788.30(a);
- An award of statutory damages of \$1,000.00 pursuant to Cal. Civ. Code § 1788.30(b);
- An award of costs of litigation and reasonable attorney's fees, pursuant to Cal. Civ. Code § 1788.30(c).
- 65. Pursuant to the seventh amendment to the Constitution of the United States of America, Plaintiff is entitled to, and demands, a trial by jury.

- 10 of 10 -

Respectfully submitted,

Hyde & Swigart

Date: December 20, 2011 By: /s/ Andrea Darrow Smith

Andrea Darrow Smith Email: andrea@westcoastlitigation.com Attorneys for Plaintiff

23

2425

26

27

28

Complaint

Case 3:11-cv-02971-MMA-POR Document 1 Filed 12/20/11 PageID.11 Page 11 of 11 CIVIL COVER SHEET

The JS 44 civil cover sheet and the information contained herein neither replace nor supplement the filing and service of pleadings or other papers as required by law, except as provided by local rules of court. This form, approved by the Judicial Conference of the United States in September 1974, is required for the use of the Clerk of Court for the purpose of initiating the civil docket sheet. (SEE INSTRUCTIONS ON THE REVERSE OF THE FORM.)

I. (a) PLAINTIFFS		DEFENDANTS	DEFENDANTS		
(b) County of Residence of First Listed Plaintiff San Diego, CA (EXCEPT IN U.S. PLAINTIFF CASES) (c) Attorney's (Firm Name, Address, and Telephone Number)		Newport Capita	County of Residence of First Listed Defendant (IN U.S. PLAINTIFF CASES ONLY) NOTE: IN LAND CONDEMNATION CASES, USE THE LOCATION OF THE LAND INVOLVED		
		County of Residence			
		Attorneys (If Known)	4ttorpeys (If Known) 111CV2971 MMAPOR		
Hyde & Swigart	e, Address, and Telephone Number)	7 ttorneys (ii known)			
, ,	South Suite 301, San Diego, CA 9210)8 🛨			
II. BASIS OF JURISI	OICTION (Place an "X" in One Box Only)			(Place an "X" in One Box for Plaintiff	
☐ 1 U.S. Government Plaintiff	■ 3 Federal Question (U.S. Government Not a Party)		PTF DEF 1		
☐ 2 U.S. Government Defendant	☐ 4 Diversity	Citizen of Another State	☐ 2 ☐ 2 Incorporated and of Business In		
Belendani	(Indicate Citizenship of Parties in Item III)	Citizen or Subject of a Foreign Country	□ 3 □ 3 Foreign Nation		
IV. NATURE OF SUI	T (Place an "X" in One Box Only) TORTS	FORFEITURE/PENALTY	BANKRUPTCY	OTHER STATUTES	
☐ 110 Insurance ☐ 120 Marine ☐ 130 Miller Act ☐ 140 Negotiable Instrument ☐ 150 Recovery of Overpayment & Enforcement of Judgment ☐ 151 Medicare Act ☐ 152 Recovery of Defaulted Student Loans (Excl. Veterans) ☐ 153 Recovery of Overpayment of Veteran's Benefits ☐ 160 Stockholders' Suits ☐ 190 Other Contract ☐ 195 Contract Product Liability ☐ 196 Franchise	Slander 330 Federal Employers' Liability Injury Product Liability Slander 1340 Marine Product Liability 340 Marine Product Liability 350 Motor Vehicle Product Liability 355 Motor Vehicle Product Liability 385 Property Damage Product Liability 385 Property Damage Product Liability Product Liability 385 Product Liability Product Liability Product Liability	- G20 Other Food & Drug	☐ 422 Appeal 28 USC 158 ☐ 423 Withdrawal	□ 400 State Reapportionment □ 410 Antitrust □ 430 Banks and Banking □ 450 Commerce □ 460 Deportation □ 470 Racketeer Influenced and Corrupt Organizations □ 480 Consumer Credit □ 490 Cable/Sat TV □ 810 Selective Service □ 850 Securities/Commodities/Exchange □ 875 Customer Challenge □ 12 USC 3410 ■ 890 Other Statutory Actions □ 891 Agricultural Acts	
REAL PROPERTY 210 Land Condemnation 220 Foreclosure 230 Rent Lease & Ejectment 240 Torts to Land 245 Tort Product Liability 290 All Other Real Property	CIVIL RIGHTS PRISONER PETITIO 441 Voting □ 510 Motions to Vaca Sentence □ 443 Housing/ Accommodations □ 530 General □ 444 Welfare □ 535 Death Penalty □ 445 Amer. w/Disabilities - Employment □ 550 Civil Rights □ 446 Amer. w/Disabilities - Other □ 440 Other Civil Rights	te	FEDERAL TAX SUITS 870 Taxes (U.S. Plaintiff or Defendant) 871 IRS—Third Party 26 USC 7609	 892 Economic Stabilization Act 893 Environmental Matters 894 Energy Allocation Act 895 Freedom of Information Act 900Appeal of Fee Determination Under Equal Access to Justice 950 Constitutionality of State Statutes 	
№ 1 Original □ 2 R	tate Court Appellate Court	Reopened another (spec	sferred from		
VII. CALICE OF A CON-	Cite the U.S. Civil Statute under which you a 15 U.S.C. § 1692 et seq.	are filing (Do not cite jurisdiction	nal statutes unless diversity):		
VI. CAUSE OF ACTI	Brief description of cause: Untair Debt Collection Practices	i			
VII. REQUESTED IN COMPLAINT:	☐ CHECK IF THIS IS A CLASS ACTION		CHECK YES only JURY DEMAND	if demanded in complaint:	
VIII. RELATED CAS IF ANY	SE(S) (See instructions): JUDGE		DOCKET NUMBER		
DATE 12/20/2011	SIGNATURE OF AS S/Andrea D. Si	TTORNEY OF RECORD	_		
FOR OFFICE USE ONLY					
RECEIPT#A	AMOUNT APPLYING IFP	JUDGE	MAG. JU	DGE	